

CERA 238 (10201695)

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 39 to 58 were rejected as allegedly obvious over the combination of Shuichi in view of Hirofumi. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner admits that Shuichi does not disclose the formula set forth in Claim 39, but alleges that Shuichi discloses the invention in Fig. 1, and, therefore, discloses the formula, i.e., inherently.

Additionally, it is not clear why Hirofumi, which is apparently cited only for disclosing a bore hole, is cited against claims that do not require a bore hole as does, for example claim 50.

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not made a *prima facie* case of obviousness. To show that a feature is inherent, the Examiner is required to show that the formula of claim 39 must necessarily flow from the disclosure of the cited reference: According to MPEP Section 2112:

IV. EXAMINER MUST PROVIDE RATIONALE OR EVIDENCE TENDING TO SHOW INHERENCY

The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 1534, 28 USPQ2d 1955, 1957 (Fed. Cir. 1993) (reversed rejection because inherency was based on what would result due to optimization of conditions, not what was necessarily present in the prior art); In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578, 581-82, 212 USPQ 323, 326 (CCPA 1981). "To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence 'must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference, and that it would be so recognized by persons of ordinary skill. Inherency, however, may not be established by probabilities or possibilities. The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.' " In re Robertson, 169 F.3d 743, 745, 49 USPQ2d 1949, 1950-51 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (citations

CERA 238 (10201695)

omitted) (The claims were drawn to a disposable diaper having three fastening elements. The reference disclosed two fastening elements that could perform the same function as the three fastening elements in the claims. The court construed the claims to require three separate elements and held that the reference did not disclose a separate third fastening element, either expressly or inherently.).

"In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art." Ex parte Levy, 17 USPQ2d 1461, 1464 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1990) (emphasis in original) (Applicant's invention was directed to a biaxially oriented, flexible dilation catheter balloon (a tube which expands upon inflation) used, for example, in clearing the blood vessels of heart patients). The examiner applied a U.S. patent to Schjeldahl which disclosed injection molding a tubular preform and then injecting air into the preform to expand it against a mold (blow molding). The reference did not directly state that the end product balloon was biaxially oriented. It did disclose that the balloon was "formed from a thin flexible inelastic, high tensile strength, biaxially oriented synthetic plastic material." Id. at 1462 (emphasis in original). The examiner argued that Schjeldahl's balloon was inherently biaxially oriented. The Board reversed on the basis that the examiner did not provide objective evidence or cogent technical reasoning to support the conclusion of inherency.).

it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not done met the burden set forth above; therefore, the rejection must be withdrawn.

Allowance is respectfully requested.

CERA 238 (10201695)

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-0624, under Order No. NY-CERA 238-US

Dated: December 15, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By


James R. Crawford

Registration No.: 39,155

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

666 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10103

(212) 318-3148

(212) 318-3400 (Fax)

Attorneys for Applicant